

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 54.—No. 7.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 14, 1825. [Price 1s.]

PAPER AND GOLD.

Kensington, 11 May, 1825.

It is now *Wednesday morning*, and, therefore, it may be necessary to give, in another part of the Register, a sort of *Postscript* to this article. But, there are some things relating to the subject of “PAPER and GOLD” that I must lose no time in noticing. The subject is of an *importance* not to be described. In this paper-money we have infallible means of putting an end to all the doctrines of the *whisker-folks*. They had, as they thought, got us in as complete order as that saucy fellow, the printer's boy of LIMOSIN, had our Royal Highness of York, when he pursued the Royal Chief to the HELDER. What a thing, for a printer's boy (General BRUNE) to make a Royal Duke capitulate! And our very best Chief too; as he, of course, must be, he being our *Chief Commander*. Well, as I was

saying, the whisker and fire-shovel set thought they *had us safe for ever*. And they had us, *saving the paper-money*. Aye; but, as HENRY II. said of BECKET'S “*saving the customs*,” that was undoing in *three* words what he had done in *three hundred*. They had us, *saving the paper-money*, and saving the *Debt*, and all the rest of the things connected with the *paper-money*. Dogs would, compared to us, have been respectable and honoured creatures, had it been possible to *go back, at once (and quietly) to gold payments*, at the peace of 1814.

Ah! but this could not be. There was the score to settle. There was the cunning *Jew* with his hook in the nose of the insolent *Norman*, holding him to a good behaviour. The *Norman* thought he *had us*; but, he found the *Jew's* hook too strong for him. The *Norman* had us *for the moment*; but, in order to *have us*, he had been obliged to call in *the aid of the Jew*. These two were

N

[ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

like sworn brothers at first. They cordially agreed in hostility against *us*. But, *both* could not have *us*. Therefore disputes arose; and before these disputes come to an end, *neither will have us!* And let them both bear that in mind.

I have not forgotten the year 1814. I have not forgotten "*Orange Boven*." I have not forgotten the *clappings* and *huzzains* of that band of base and stupid fellows, and insolent, aye, and roguish withal; I have not forgotten the day, when this band of vile ruffians insulted us by *clapping* and *huzzaining* the fellow who cut his own throat at North Cray in Kent; and I shall never be satisfied, until *justice* be executed on that band. It may require some little time yet; but the paper-money will cause that justice to be executed. This is a thing that sticks about like birdlime; and the great **THING** of all things is held and checked and hampered by it at every turn. Sometimes the hag seems to be got quite free from it; but, the moment she begins to make any thing of a movement worth speaking of, she finds herself fastened in some of her feathers. She finds a wing glued up to her side, or hanging to her rump; and down she tumbles, and staggers

about like a fowl that is shot. After she got the Small-note Bill out, she began to take short flights, and really seemed, only the other day, as if she could again take a tour in the air. But, all of a sudden, she felt herself hampered again; and hampered she now is, thanks be to God; for, if she were not hampered, I, for my part, rather than be an Englishman, would be a cur dog.

This paper-money is the everlasting bridle in the mouth of all that is base, corrupt, and tyrannical in this country. It is like death to the sinner that believes in an hereafter; or, at any rate, that has his doubts and fears about the matter. Corruption, in the midst of her revelry, is haunted by her fears respecting the result of the paper-money. She well knows that yeomanry cavalry are here wholly out of the question. In short, this paper-money acts as a shield while it lasts, and in its destruction, it will be a deliverance the most complete. Before I proceed to notice what has happened since last week relative to the paper and the gold, I cannot refrain from begging the reader to recollect for a moment the pretty notions that were afloat amongst the land-people, at the time when Peel's Bill was under considera-

tion. It was curious enough to see all the landlords for this Bill of Peel! Not a man of them even hinted a word against it; and that extraordinary person, the prime quality of whose mind is so aptly expressed by the last syllable of his name, Sir JOHN SEBRIGHT, was so much in favour of PEEL'S BILL, that he said he would join even Mr. HUNT, rather than not have it passed! This taste of the landholders, at the time that I am alluding to; the opinions which they then put forth; the reasons which they gave for their support of Peel's Bill; these discover a *size of mind*, if I may so express myself, wholly, I believe, without a match. They chuckled, while the Bill was going through the Houses; and they said, to one another, laughing, "It is time to *pull these paper-gentry down a bit*." At other times, they insisted on the *justice* of making these banker-people *pay in gold*! At other times, they used to talk about the satisfaction that they should have in receiving their rents in the King's coin; and not in the dirty paper that used to be afloat.

This really appears to be a thing not to be believed. But, it is to be believed, and any thing more true never was uttered. It

is monstrous to suppose it to be true; but it is true. And it is proved, beyond all possibility of doubt, by the unanimous vote which these people gave for Peel's Bill. In giving their assent to that Bill, they thought that they were making provision for pulling down the stock-jobbing crew; whereas they were enacting that the stock-jobbing crew should be raised up higher than ever. They thought that they were providing for getting gold in place of paper, in payment of their rents; and they were enacting that they should receive no rents at all. They thought, that, some how or other, they were making the money-people give up something; and they were enacting, that the money-people should, in the first place, receive two bushels of wheat instead of one, and, in the next place, that they should have the whole of the landed estates. They were chuckling in the thought that they were going to cast the money-jobbers into the shade; and they were enacting that their children, if not themselves, should be the footmen and grooms and housemaids and scullions of the money-jobbers.

Never was such a scene in the whole world before. They positively enacted their own utter

ruin; and, if PEEL'S Bill had gone into full force on the 1st of May 1823, according to the solemn pledge of the Parliament; if that Bill had gone into full effect, and had continued in full effect to this day; that is to say, if it had remained in full force for only two years, the ruin of the main body of the lords and the gentlemen of the landed estates would have been complete. They would have been totally ruined. Their estates must have been taken away from even their nominal possession. They must have been put into the hands of the overseers of the poor, in order that provision might be made for the poor out of those estates. Now, this was their own work. It was entirely the work of their own hands. Nobody urged them to it; and I say that an instance of such profound ignorance is nowhere to be found upon record.

They did not, however, continue on to their utter ruin and extinguishment. I think they approached their ruin much nearer than they would have done, if they had not had me at their elbow. I continued to taunt them; and I verily believe that that taunting deprived many a score of them of the better halves of their estates. It was such horrible

disgrace to do that which I told them they must do, that I am sure, or very nearly sure, that they kept on with PEEL'S BILL more than a year longer than they would have done, had it not been for fear of the ridicule to be cast upon them. I shall, by-and-by show, perhaps, that they only jumped out of the frying-pan into the fire; or, rather, jumped into the cauldron to get out of the gridiron; but, I shall now, before I proceed further with any general reflections, notice certain things that have taken place since the last Register went to the press.

The dealings amongst the wretches in 'Change Alley appear to be in that sort of state that dealings generally are in when the dealers do not know what is going to happen. The *funds*, as they are called, remain at much about the price that they were at last week. The *Morning Chronicle* of to-day (Wednesday) tells us that "*some gold* has been received from the Continent. The amount is not large; but, just at this moment, the circumstance attracts notice." Yes, it attracts notice, indeed; for it is a very curious matter that gold should be coming into the country in *small quantities* while it is going out in *large quantities*. I

told my readers, in my last Register, that the newspapers now lie like valets. They are all connected with the stock-jobbers. Some of the principal papers are actually owned in part by stock-jobbers. This is as well known as it is known that St. Paul's Church is on Ludgate-hill. These newspapers make an essential part of the stock-jobbing, or paper system. The Bank, I mean the mother bank, does not rest upon the credit given to her paper more completely, than these newspapers rest upon the existence of the funds, and upon the dealing of 'Change Alley. It is, all taken together, most appropriately denominated a paper-system. Whenever the mother bank paper shall sink, every newspaper in London will sink along with it. They are vehicles of lies or of truth, as their interests require. But they have all an interest in lying, as far as regards the funds and the paper-money.

Upon what other ground are we to account for this ridiculous lie in the *Morning Chronicle*, that some gold has been received from the continent, when it is notorious that many thousands of ounces of gold are sent to the continent every week. These newspapers are, however, exceedingly embarrassed

just at this moment. A part of their trade consists in selling stupid lies, such as please the vulgarist of the vulgar. They, therefore, are mighty people for *cheap corn*. Now, it so happens, that the state of things which they have found it their interest to represent as a state of prosperity, has arisen all the time that corn has been getting dearer and dearer; and that while corn was cheap, the country was in a state that every one called distress. This is an embarrassing matter for the brothers of the broad sheet. The prosperity has come on regularly with the dear corn; and yet this band of brothers want cheap corn to make the people happy!

A greater embarrassment, however, arises from the reflection, that, if you have cheap corn, you cannot have the taxes to keep up the funding system with. You must give up one or the other. This is very embarrassing to the brothers, to whom both are necessary. They perceive that it is to their interest that the taxes should all be paid. You hear them talk about taking off taxes, about the hardship of certain taxes, and the like; but you never hear them talk about *lessening the amount of the revenue*. Like good patriots, they would

tain ease the nation of its burdens; but, brim full of national faith and national honour, they would have the revenue continue as large as it is now.

Thus they are involved in continual inconsistencies and contradictions; but, very few things have embarrassed them so much as the necessity for one or the other of these two things: *dear corn*, or a *blowing up of the funding system*.

Then, even this dear corn is attended with its dangers to the funding system. Dear corn is a very blessed thing for the landlords and farmers; but, in order to have this dear corn, there must be a great quantity of paper-money afloat; and this quantity of paper-money endangers the whole fabric; endangers that mass of *good things* in which the landlords and their families largely share. This set would gladly send the fund-set to the devil; but they cannot, *without breaking up her whole concern*.

Thus stands the affair; and the quantity of paper-money out at this moment is so great, that the gold cannot remain and freely circulate with it. Indeed, there is, strictly speaking, *no circulating money in England, except paper-money*. This is the fact; and this must be the case, unless the paper-money be so reduced in quantity as to cause the land-people to be ruined. But, then, this being the case, *how long can the Bank continue to pay in gold?* Not very long, certainly; but, *within a few months* it might be difficult to guess.

In the mean while every day's occurrence shows, that a change must come; that there must be

another *stoppage*, or, wheat at 4s. a *bushe*. The other night, in the House of Commons, PASCOE GRENFELL asked how much paper-money the mother Bank had out. He was told by a bankman, that he had no business to ask, now that the Bank paid in *gold*. However, it seems that an answer was given, and that he was told, that the Old Mother had out paper-money to the amount of *twenty millions*, which is very nearly as much as she ever had. But, I think nothing of *these accounts*. I never believe in the truth of any paper laid before Parliament, unless it be of a nature to admit of *proof*. Who is fool enough to rely upon the *bare words* of the bank people?

This, however, is not the interesting matter. The interesting matter is, *what* induced PASCOE to ask the question! There must have been some motive for the asking of such a question by Pascoe. Pascoe, who is a great amateur in the Bank way, would not have asked such a question without rhyme or reason. I remember Pascoe's proposition, when the *Small Note Bill* was passed. He said, (one fine day), that there ought to be a clause in the Bill to enable country bankers to *pay their notes in Bank of England notes*, or in gold, at their *option*! Upon seeing this in one of the broad-sheeted reports, I exclaimed: "Ah! Pascoe! Sayest thou so, Pascoe! Well, then, all that I have to tell thee, is, that I shall have the *feast of the gridiron* the moment that such a clause become law."

This scared little VAN, who, though he had himself talked of such a clause, did not introduce it;

and thus the Small Note Bill went out without this protecting, or, legal-tender clause. This clause would have been a whole repeal of *Peel's Bill*. It would have been legal-tender; and, mind, the clause must come at last; or we shall have wheat at 4s. a bushel. There is a country beast, who publishes a newspaper, called the "*NORTHAMPTON MERCURY*," who has some remarks upon this subject, that may serve to show how happy Mr. BROUGHAM was, when he designated this broad-sheeted brotherhood as the "best public instructors that human imagination could devise." This beast of a "*Mercury*" of last week tells those whom it is his business to "instruct," that "there was something like an alarm, or a panic, in the funds on Saturday; the English and Foreign Securities were all on the decline. The Foreign Exchanges being so much against England, and the consequent export of specie, is one of the causes of depression; two other causes are alleged, the fear of Ireland being disturbed, if the Catholic Relief-Bill be not carried, and an absurd story, that the Bank will again suspend cash payments." Then follows, in a separate paragraph, "COBBETT SAYS the country bankers have made immense issues of notes." Well, beast, and what then? Beast indeed you must be, if you do not know that they have made such issues. After this comes the following, which I give as a specimen of the works of these "best public instructors." The words are these: "Wheat is nearly three times the price that *Cobbett said*, three years since, it would be at about this

period. Every thing will be lower and lower," said Cobbett, "till *Peel's Bill* be repealed, instead of which, every thing has got higher and higher; and yet *Peel's Bill* is not repealed."

Ah, you stupid vagabond "best public instructor," you could not help lying. It was in your nature, and out it must come. You, fool as you are, have wit enough to lie; and, I dare say, that the jolterheads and chuckleheads believe you, when you say, that "*Peel's Bill* is not repealed," and that they also believe, that nothing was done in 1822 to produce a temporary effect equal, or nearly equal (as to prices) to such repeal! No matter, beast, the delusion is not destined to be long-lived. But, the worst of it is, with regard to a beast like you, that there is no punishment for you. You have no sense of shame; and, if you had, nobody knows you; and, if anybody did know you, it would be as one knows an inanimate substance. You are as safe as a stone that hurts one's toe. There is no inflicting vengeance on you.

After the above, this beast goes on, thus: "Many a farmer and dealer in grain has had occasion to rue the day, that they placed reliance on *Cobbett's* opinion; for many sold their stacks of grain in consequence of such an opinion having been put forth so confidently; many now wish they had attended to what Lord Liverpool said, who asserted, that grain, like every thing else, would come round, and be again at a remunerating price." Wretched beast! But, this answers his purpose; and, when this remunerating work

shall produce a bank-stoppage, this beast will talk as confidently as ever; and will go on in his capacity of "best public instructor."

However, these *MERCURIES*, all over the country, are in *great alarm*, lest the stoppage should come. Their editors are a band of the most ignorant creatures, of the dullest dogs that God ever suffered to exist. There is the *Norwich Mercury*, the *Leeds Mercury*, the *Liverpool Mercury*, this *Northampton Mercury*, and many others, which surpass all that ever was before heard of, in ignorance, dullness, and childishness; and they all seem to have entered into a solemn compact to speak evil of me.

"Hated by fools, and fools to hate:

"Be this my motto and my fate."

They have had a fine time of it of late! while the paper-money has been *coming out* and *prices rising*. The beasts had no idea (how should they?) that the *gold would go away*, and that there would come another stoppage. They thought, that things were *come about*; and that they should have to talk for the rest of their lives, about "*COBBETT'S false prophecies*." So that the alarm amongst them *now* is quite distressing. The beast of the *Morning Herald* is prepared to insist, that my prophecies will be falsified, even if there be another Bank-restriction! But, this beast does not seem to hearten up the others. They cannot hide their fears and their chagrin; and, as to *BOTT SMITH* (of *private letter notoriety*) of the *Liverpool Mercury*, he discovers a degree of mortification that would lead one

to suppose, that he will, when the stoppage take place, actually cut his throat. This really does *BOTT* credit: it shows that he has *some feeling* left, notwithstanding his connexion with Cropper and with the *Great Icicle*, Burdett. *BOTT* little dreams of the *fame* that is in store for him! He is to be one of the characters in the *Farce* which we shall have acted, as part of the entertainments at the *Feast of the Gridiron*. Poor *BOTT*! I think I see him now, coming forward on the stage, *solus*, with a *private letter* in his hand but I must not anticipate.

These vagabonds all see the consequences of another stoppage, as far as relates *to them and to me*. I will get the names of all the owners of these papers, and string them up. They are aware that there will be no bounds to my exultation, or to my means of degrading them, if they be not already too low to admit of degradation. And I do not want a *stoppage*: that is not necessary to me: I would as lief that the *paper should be drawn in*; for that will answer my purpose full as well. Nothing will answer the purpose of the vagabond *Mercuries* but the *present quantity of paper and no stoppage*. Both the vagabonds cannot have for any length of time. I do not care for any tricks that may be played about *funds or exchanges*. I know that there are great means of playing such tricks; but, I also know, that they can effect nothing except a mere *putting off* of the evil hour; and that, too, *not for long*; and I know, besides, that every one of these tricks will tend

to make the END more distressing to the tricksters. The Editor of the Morning Chronicle seems "*hurt*," as the saying is, that I should be "*brandishing the Grid-iron again*." Again! Aye, and again! And why not? It shall not be mere brandishing, I warrant, when the time comes. It will be the day of the nation's triumph as well as of mine; and that day shall be celebrated in suitable style.

CATHOLIC BILL.

THIS Bill passed the House of Commons on *Tuesday night last*. There were for it 248, against it 227; so that it was carried by a majority of 21. It is pretty curious, that SIR FRANCIS BURDETT (the Isleworth-miller and purity-of-election candidate), who first moved in this affair, who moved for the Bill, who brought it in, never opened his lips in defence of it, left it after the second reading, and never even came to witness its fate! What can you do with such a "purity-of-election" man? What can you make of such a "Westminster's pride"? How the devil are you to *get on* with such an "England's glory"? This is his old way: sure to disappoint all those that depend on him. What a fickle, what a tricky, what an inconstant thing it has always been! Who, after having brought in this Bill, after having represented it as "*absolutely necessary to the salvation of the country*;" who, after this, except this hero of BOTT SMITH, would have left it to take its chance? Who would have done such a

thing, except the man, who, seeing half a million of people collected together to conduct him in triumph from the Tower, could slip out the back way, and leave that half million of people to conduct an empty carriage to his house? And who, after any one of a score or two of shilly-shally and worse than childish acts that are well known, who (after any one of these) but a man with a great parcel of *acres* of land, would *still find people to praise him*.

This is what may well be called *consummate baseness*. I can find an excuse for those who flatter and fawn for the sake of bread, or for the sake of gain of any sort. But this *love of the acres*; this *admiration of the acres*; this is *innate baseness*. Injustice is always hateful; but, it is never so hateful as when it appears in favour of the rich *merely on account of their riches*. The *gout* is not pretended this time; and, there was, unfortunately, no "*fall of snow*," such as that which once kept the hero from a Westminster Meeting. But, it really is a shame to waste paper and time on a thing so completely contemptible.

THE CATHOLICS, if they have sense and spirit, such as belonged to their ancestors, will turn from this shilly shally thing with disdain, and will *begin to think seriously of what they ought now to do*, in order to obtain and secure their rights. They must now be satisfied, that, if they have ever believed in the sincerity of their pretended friends, they have been *grossly deceived*. But, away with all *nonsense*: there will *never* be any *emancipation*, except there be *events* to produce it; and all

that the Catholics have to as themselves, is, *whether they possess the means of hastening such events*. There is, for instance, one event with regard to which they might do much. It is to me clear as daylight, that all that the Catholics demand would be instantly given them, if once we were to "*return to the currency of our ancestors*." The SPEAKER, Manners, who now speaks against Catholic Emancipation, told the Regent, in 1819, that the House had *resolved* to return to this currency; and he *congratulated* the Regent on the important and happy measure. Well, we were getting on towards the "currency of our ancestors;" but, now, alas! we are got *all into paper again*! I am perfectly satisfied, that if we were to come to the "currency of our ancestors" *to-morrow*, the religion of those ancestors would cease to be persecuted *the day after to-morrow*. This I am *sure* of; and, therefore, the Catholics may talk as long as they please about their *religion*; but, they will never make me believe, that they *care much about it*, as long as I see them *voluntarily* handing about that paper-money, which is their great enemy, and, indeed, the *sole obstacle* to the restoration of their rights.

Come, Father Benedict, let me have a word with you about this same paper-money. It *arose out of hostility to the Catholic religion*. James II. was giving his Catholic subjects something like fair-play; he was restoring them to a small part of their rights. This was his *great offence*. He was overet by the "Deliverer," and a "Glorious Revolution" took place. All the world, or, at least,

every man of any information, knows, that, in order to *uphold that revolution*; in order to keep out the *Catholic King*; a *national debt and paper-money were invented*. This is notorious. Without these that king could not have been kept out, and, perhaps, the Abbey-lands could not have been prevented from returning to the Church and the poor. The paper-money upheld the "Glorious Revolution," and the "Glorious Revolution," which was a sort of "Protestant Reformation," No. 2, kept out the Catholic King and forged new chains for the Catholic people.

This, Father Benedict, is the short history of that accursed thing, *paper-money*. It was a Protestant invention to keep down Catholics; and, it is by no means impossible, nor unlikely, that its destruction may be followed by a signal triumph of that Church which it was intended wholly to annihilate in this kingdom. This paper-money cannot give way to coin *without bringing Catholic emancipation*; and, is it not *your* duty, then, to use and to induce others to use, no money but gold and silver? The enemies of your religion have no power but through the means of paper-money. It is curious that it was a paper-money that enabled the revolution people to upset the Church in France. It was loans and a paper-money that were doing the like work in Spain. Is it right, then, *voluntarily*, to support, or to help to support, such a thing as this?

If the present paper-money were pushed hard by the *carrying of it in for payment*; if only a small part of the people were to

do this, the present paper-money would give way to the King's coin; and then every change that you and I want to see would instantly take place. The CATHOLIC BILL is, they say, to be read a second time, in the Lords, *next Tuesday*. There is, this day, no man who expects that Bill to pass; but, if real gold payments were to return *to-morrow*, everybody would expect that Bill to pass next week.

What we want is a *gold and silver currency*. Not gold locked up at the Bank; but gold in circulation. The thing is in such a state now as to make its continuance a matter of the greatest uncertainty. A little more gold drawn out might *put ail to rights* in quick time. Every bank in the country is exposed to a demand of gold in exchange for its notes. If the people of any third part of a county, or any tenth part of a county, were to carry in their notes and insist on gold, there would be an end of the system. Nay, as I, the other day, told some *reformers of the North*, the *workmen in any one large town* might, if they would, blow up the banks of that town, or, which would be the same in effect, make them *shut up shop*. Men may *talk* about their political principles; but, they shall never make me believe that they have any, as long as I see that they will not move one inch, will not take the trouble to go and demand gold in exchange for paper, though they must be *sure*, that they never can see any change for the better as long as gold is kept out of circulation.

The Catholics are a *numerous body*. They are rich, too. They

might, here in London, by only going and using the means which they possess of causing us to return to "the currency of our ancestors;" only by doing this, they might, *in one week at farthest*, put all things in a fair way. The thing will do itself *in time*; but, the Catholics will have none of the merit, unless they assist, and zealously assist in doing it. There are, probably, 200,000 Catholics in England, each of whom has at least twenty pounds ready money, at his command. Here are *four millions* of pounds. Let every one of these Catholics *get twenty sovereigns into his hands* ON THE FIRST DAY OF JUNE NEXT! He may pay them away the next day, or that same day; no matter; the effect would be *complete*, and it would, besides, cause us to return to "*the currency of our ancestors*," a thing which the Parliament of 1819, *resolved* to do. The thing will *do itself*, mind: I am quite sure of that: but its motions might be *quickened*: it might be assisted, as nature is assisted by the *accoucheur*. The lady is, in this case, *in years*. She is not in full vigour, and, therefore, she needs assistance. A very little is sufficient; but, that little ought not to be withheld.

In *Ireland*, good God, how efficient this aid! There are six millions of people; there is, in short, a *nation*, praying and imploring and supplicating in vain; and, all the while that they are thus imploring in vain, they are *voluntarily*, and, as it would seem, with *singular pleasure*, receiving and circulating little bits of paper, which are, in reality, the chains that bind them to that from which

they pray to be freed. It would require only one single effort in Ireland to cause a return to the "*currency of our ancestors.*" What could be more laudable in itself? What more loyal; what better calculated to convince his GRACE of YORK of the attachment of the Catholics to the HOUSE of BRUNSWICK? In short, it is so plain a matter; the remedy is so certain; so absolutely free from all objection, that it seems to me that it must be mere laziness, mere indifference towards country as well as towards religion, to neglect the putting of it in practice. If I were a Catholic and living in Ireland, and were a person generally known amongst my persecuted brethren, I could make known to them my intention as to the day when I should go to demand gold. I should advise them all to do the same *on the same day*; and, I am not to be made to believe, that there would not be a large portion of the people to follow my advice and to act on my example. I am satisfied that, if it were believed that the Catholics would do this, their enemies would give way. At any rate, why not do it, since it can do no one harm, and may do such a great quantity of good.

The paper-money is the last resource of "*the Reformation.*" Pauperism, crimes of all sorts, usury everlasting. A want of confidence in all dealings; every species of corruption that society is liable to; a standing army in time of peace; soldiers at every corner of a street; every evil that we know any thing of, seems to have sprung from this one root; but the paper-money crowns the whole, binds all of them together, and, as long as it exists, takes away all

chance of any thing like a restoration to public happiness. Above all things, it gives the power to oppress. It keeps us from enjoying our rights; and, therefore, as every man may lawfully refuse to receive it; as it is no lawful money of the country; as it is a thing which is merely permitted; as it is a thing which is merely not criminal, surely it is the duty of every man to cast it from him, and to prefer the legal coin of the country. It was a crime to utter this paper-money; the law made it a crime until the year 1797. It was then made not criminal. It was about to become criminal again in virtue of Peel's Bill; but, in July 1822, that Bill was so far repealed as to make it not criminal to issue this paper-money. So that, it is barely not a crime to put this detestable thing forth. Not only may we refuse to take it in payment, but if we happen to possess a bit of it, the issuer of it is, upon our demand, compelled to give us gold for it. Why, therefore, need any man be ashamed or afraid to go and demand gold for this paper? There is no trouble attending it. You may refuse to take it, in the first place; but, in the next place, you can go and change it, or send and change it, at your pleasure; and as it is really and truly this paper-money which is the cause of the continued persecution of the Catholics, I must say that one can think but very little of the sincerity of that Catholic who gives his voluntary support to this paper-money. There are many; nay, there are many hundreds of Catholics, any one man of whom might, if he would, put an end to this system of paper-money. I say this deliberately,

I declare it to be a thing of easy accomplishment, by means perfectly lawful and every way laudable and honourable. I could name twenty Catholics in England, either of whom might abate this nuisance; but, I perceive in these Catholics in England very little of that spirit by which alone they will ever obtain redress. Their means are prayers and solicitations; crawlings and coaxings; and by these means they will never succeed. They should consider that it is not mere pardon that they are asking for; not a mere forgiveness for something that they have done, nor is it a mere exemption from penalties and restraints that they are asking for. They are asking for a share of political and judicial power. They are asking for a share in the rank, honours, and emoluments which the Government have to distribute; and they ought to recollect that no men ever took in sharers, in such excellently good things, unless they got some value in exchange, or, unless they were *compelled* to take in such sharers. It is useless to pray and implore. Men never give up such solid things, merely in consequence of being prayed to do it. This the Catholics should always keep in mind; and, if they were to keep this in mind, they would think more about *doing* something that would tend to make their opponents see that it was their interests to give way. They would think more about this, and less about *petitioning*. And nothing could they do, more likely to be effectual, than the very thing that I am recommending. However, I am by no means sanguine enough to imagine that my advice will be

followed. When I see Catholic noblemen, having twenty or thirty thousand pounds a-year each, circulating about, carrying in their pocket-books, the little dirty bits of paper, which are, in fact, the cause of their exclusion from the House of Lords; when I see these noblemen cherishing these dirty little rag-shops; and, when I saw them, during the last war, hastening to join associations for circulating the Bank paper, for taking that paper in payment for rent, and stigmatising all those as Jacobins, who would not do the same, and who wished the destruction of the scandalous fiction; when I see Catholic noblemen acting thus, how am I to imagine that they have spirit enough left to do any thing but creep and crawl and pray and weep?

Again I have to observe, that the case of the paper-money will be decided without any extraordinary exertion on the part of anybody. Only, if it be left to time, the Catholics will have no merit in the decision. The gold and silver will bring them emancipation; but, it may not come so soon as if they were to exert themselves in an endeavour to hasten it. The remedy is quite certain. Whenever there is an end to the present paper; that is to say, a paper in exchange for which gold is demandable, one of two things must come, a stoppage at the Bank, which would send us out a paper not convertible into gold, or a disappearance of the paper altogether. Either of these would lead to the same result; namely, an incapacity to pay the interest of the debt, and the salaries of the dead-weight in

full. A deduction from the dividends and the dead-weight must then be made. It is nonsense to talk of *paying them in full in gold*. There must be a great deduction. Well, we are ready, then, to make this deduction. No question but the landlords would be ready to make it. No, say the people, you are not to make that deduction; you are not to "rob the widow and the orphan" and the worn soldier. You are "not to do that, and to keep your estates untouched. You are not to rob all these people, and leave such an immense revenue in the hands of the Clergy." "Give us Parliamentary Reform, indeed, and we will see what can be done; but, unless you give us that; unless you first agree to that, every acre of your land goes to satisfy the just demands of the widow, the orphan and the worn soldier."

This it is that frightens Whitehall, and all those that create and support Whitehall. This it was that drove them to the present paper-money. They must have known that it could not last; it obtained them a respite. That respite cannot be of much longer duration, and it may end in one month if the Catholics have the spirit to act as becomes them. If they do thus act, they will have the thanks of the whole country; if they do not, they will only neglect to do good to themselves; but they should always recollect that, in this latter case, they will, in a great measure, be deprived of the ground of complaint which they now have.

WM. COBBETT.

PARKINS AND BROUGHAM.

WELL matched. They praised each other; and, each is richly worthy of the other's praise. The client seems to have been made for the advocate, and the advocate for the client. The reader will see, that I am about to speak of the conduct of these two worthies, relative to the case of poor BYRNE, in whose behalf, or in whose name, the first of these two *collected money*, for which money poor BYRNE was, at last, compelled to bring an action. The action was tried, in the Court of King's Bench, on the 16th of February 1824.

The case was this: A fellow of the name of PARKINS, very notorious in London, and, indeed, throughout the country; a fellow, who, it seems, amassed a great parcel of money together in the East Indies, where he was a coach-maker, or, a mechanic, or chapman of some sort; this fellow, the moment the affair of BISHOP JOCELYN had, in August 1822, brought out the history of the sufferings of BYRNE; the moment that *public interest was excited* in favour of the sufferer, and that a *subscription for him had been proposed*, forth stepped this PARKINS, and made such a noise, by *letters, paragraphs and speeches*, that the town was half stunned. He held meetings at public-houses, published his speeches at those meetings; he put forth letters and paragraphs endless. He notified that he had *numerous tin boxes* put up, at different places, in order to collect money for, as he

called him, "the *late* unfortunate, but *now* fortunate BYRNE." In short, it was, for some weeks, next to impossible to get along through the newspapers, without seeing something, more or less in praise of the "GENEROSITY," as Mr. Brougham calls it, of this his worthy client.

Several persons spoke to me about Parkins being at the head of the thing. But, he had *put himself there*. He had begun to receive subscriptions; and, in short, he was suffered to go on, which, indeed, was not to be prevented without a deadly quarrel with him. I was told, that there must be a *lawsuit* at last; and thus it turned out.

BYRNE came to England soon after the subscription was begun. But, he never could, nor could I ever, nor could anybody else that I could learn, get Parkins to say **HOW MUCH MONEY HE HAD RECEIVED**; and he never talked to any of us about a *settlement* with Byrne. This poor man stood, however, in *need of subsistence*. His family, too, had now arrived in England. They stood in need of lodging, fuel, and food and clothing. And, at the end of some weeks, PARKINS began to *dole them two pounds a week*. This went on for half a year, or thereabouts. But, not only was poor Byrne eager for a settlement of some sort, he, besides, found the weekly two pounds got from Mr. Brougham's "*generous*" client with more and more difficulty. At last, Parkins would pay no more; and poor BYRNE had the good fortune to find in Mr. HARMER, an attorney able and willing to take his case into Court.

The trial, as before stated, took

place in February 1824. Parkins **DENIED THAT HE OWED BYRNE ANY THING**; and the Jury decided that he owed the poor man **ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY ODD POUNDS**. The *fellow said*, that he had, in the whole, from first to last, received only about *a hundred and fifty pounds*. He said, that, in one way and another, he had *laid out this for Byrne, or paid it to him*; so that he *owed him nothing*. This was what the fellow said; this was the assertion of Mr. Brougham's "*generous*" client; but the *jury said*, that the fellow still owed BYRNE *one hundred and ninety odd pounds!* The abuse which this fellow had heaped upon BYRNE, when the latter applied for money, was, according to BYRNE's account, most outrageous. He used to complain to me and my family; but, what were we to do with the fellow? We could not make him pay. At last, however, when we were getting forward a subscription, in order to go to law with him, Mr. HARMER was so good as to take the thing in hand himself.

Parkins, not relishing the verdict against him, applied for a *new trial*, which he obtained; and thus poor Byrne has been kept out of his money for more than a whole year longer, while that money ought to have been in his hands more than two years ago. The former was a *common jury*, and PARKINS now applied for a *special one*. This jury gave Byrne **ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THREE POUNDS**, and not the 196*l.* as the last jury did, because a Mr. Scott, whose evidence was in favour of the

greater sum, could not now attend, **he being at Newcastle-upon-Tyne**; and, of course, there was not now evidence to warrant that larger sum being given.

With this exception, the verdict was the same in both instances. Parkins had now had two trials; he had had a common jury and a special jury. At the first trial he had Mr. MARRYAT and another lawyer to plead his cause. He was not pleased with them; and, at the last trial, he *pleaded his cause himself*. He had now most ample opportunity to tell his whole story, which he did, at about *three hours and a half in length*. He spared nothing that he could do: he protested, he vowed, he most solemnly declared, he called God to witness the correctness of his account, pressed his hand to his left side, and actually (as I have been assured) squeezed some brine out of those two lovely grey and white things, which nature has taken care to shelter by brows, the colour of that charming esculent which is usually the companion of corned beef. Yes, actually *squeezed out some drops of brine*, when he implored the jury to believe, that his account was correct, and that he had not kept from Byrne a farthing of his money. Alas! he protested, vowed, declared, pressed his left side, squeezed brine from his eyes (as we have seen it squeezed out from between the flesh and gristle of a brisket of beef), called God to witness, prayed and implored, *and all in vain!*

The trial, of which I have been just speaking, took place on the *15th of last month*; that is, in the sittings next before Easter Term.

When the term came, the fellow was *at it again*. Two juries did not satisfy him. He wanted *another trial*. He had taken up the time of the Court with his speeches, protestations, and examinations, not less, in the whole, than *eight hours*; and yet he wanted *another trial!* This application was, however, refused by the Court; so that he must now *pay that money*, which he so solemnly declared he *did not owe*.

Parkins employed Mr. BROUGHAM (the poor unfortunate Queen's Attorney-General) to endeavour to get this new trial for him; and the advocate seems to have laboured most earnestly to accomplish the purpose. I, in a late Register, just recorded the *result* of the last trial, not thinking it worth while to bestow any more ink or paper on a fellow like Parkins; but here, in this motion for a second new trial, the East India fellow has a *partner*; and that partner PRAISES Parkins. Every thing he states, then, *he himself is answerable for*; for, he says, I say so and so on the authority of a generous and excellent man.

Now, then, Mr. BROUGHAM, you have, agreeably to the report of the trial (which report I find in the Morning Chronicle), said *many things that are false*; you told the Court many *barefaced lies*: therefore that report is false, or you are that which it is unnecessary for me to name. And mind, Sir, here we have an instance of the mischief of *publishing reports of proceedings in courts of justice*. A string of lies upon me are here sent all over the world, as truths stated by you. What is it to me, whe-

ther the lies originated with you, or with your client (so worthy of you), or with your brother Scotchman of the *Morning Chronicle*? The things are lies; and the newspaper ("best possible public instructor") is the liar, or you are; and that, too, with a fee in your pocket from such a fellow as Parkins!

I shall here insert the *whole of the report*, that I may not be accused of garbling. The reader will see, that, if the report be correct, your main object was to **ATTACK ME**, to *misrepresent me*, to do my character injury, to pay me back a little of what I have so abundantly advanced you; and, if you had paid me in my own coin, *truth*, I should never have complained. As it is (if this report be true) you, with Parkins's fee to cover you; aye, covered by the fee of Parkins, took occasion to seek, by falsehood, revenge for attacks, always founded in truth.

BYRNE V. PARKINS.—This was an action for money had and received by the defendant to the plaintiff's use. At the trial before the Lord Chief Justice at the late Sittings for Middlesex, the plaintiff had a verdict for 153*l.* 5*s.*

Mr. Brougham now moved for a rule to show cause why the verdict should not be set aside, and a new trial granted, on the ground that the verdict was against evidence, and also upon affidavits impeaching the validity of the testimony upon which the verdict was obtained. This was the second trial of the same cause of action. On the former occasion, the plaintiff recovered a verdict for 194*l.* 4*s.* 4*d.*, and the Court was pleased to order a new trial on payment by the defendant of no more than 60*l.* into Court. On the late trial, a verdict for 153*l.* 5*s.* was found,

but the defendant now sought to reduce that verdict, or set it aside altogether, and have a third trial, on the ground that the damages were excessive, and contrary to the real merits and justice of the case. In presenting this motion to the Court, the Learned Counsel said he could only vindicate the imperfection of his manner of doing so, from the circumstance of his not having been concerned for the defendant in either of the two trials which had taken place. From this cause he certainly laboured under some little difficulty, for he derived his information as to what occurred on the last trial, from the affidavit of the defendant himself, and from a slight note furnished him of the cross-examination of one of the witnesses. He had not heard the trial, and having been present only for about ten minutes, it might be truly said that he was very scantily furnished with materials in support of his motion. The first ground he had to urge was, perhaps, of rather a novel nature—namely, that the defendant had not the benefit of any legal assistance in the conduct of his defence. On the late trial he was without Counsel, and had conducted the cause in person. This might be said to be an accident, for which the defendant himself was alone responsible. In conducting his own case however, he must say for the defendant, that the motive which had induced him to forbear retaining Counsel, was not to be discommended, this being a case peculiarly of a personal nature affecting his own character. In such a case, a party was frequently better qualified to do himself justice by his own personal exertions than by confiding his interests to a professional advocate. Indeed his (Mr. B.'s) own experience confirmed the opinion, that in cases of a personal nature, where the character of the party was at stake, considerable advantages resulted from presenting himself before the Jury, and submitting his conduct and character to their consideration, by a

just exposition of the motives by which he was actuated. In this instance, however, the defendant had to labour under peculiar disadvantages, for although he had not retained Counsel, yet he had employed a respectable and intelligent attorney to assist him in the conduct of his case, and in the expectation of having the benefit of his experience, he had gone to trial. Unfortunately, however, for the defendant, when the day of trial arrived, he found himself completely destitute of that assistance he had anticipated, for, on the very night before the trial, his attorney was taken dangerously ill, and was confined to his house by a serious malady. In this situation he was forced on to trial, with no other assistance than the attorney's clerk, who, from his want of experience in the profession, and from his ignorance of what had taken place on the former trial, was absolutely disqualified from affording him any useful assistance in the management of the cause.

Mr. Justice Bayley.—That might have been a ground of moving to postpone the trial.

Mr. Brougham said, that the defendant was not aware of the illness of his attorney until the instant the cause was called on. The attorney had been suddenly taken ill, and if the defendant had had the advantage of Counsel's advice, he most probably would have made an application to postpone the trial.

Mr. Justice Bayley.—Can we adopt a different rule in cases of this kind, according as a party has or has not Counsel? There must be a general rule applicable to all cases.

Mr. Brougham observed, that from the want of legal assistance, and from the defendant's natural ignorance of the mode of examining witnesses, he was unable to elicit from the witnesses examined, points of evidence, material to the merits of his case. Had he had the skill of an experienced Attorney to aid him, he would have got out of the witnesses some

most important facts, as they respected the justice of the cause. It was not the amount of the verdict, in a pecuniary point of view, of which the defendant complained, but it was a most serious thing to him to have such a verdict as this recorded against him, as it respected his character. Mr. Parkins, with his large fortune, thought little of a sum of 153*l.*; but considering that the effect of such a verdict, under the peculiar circumstances of this case, *must tend to impeach his character*, he had the deepest reason to deplore the want of that professional assistance which would have enabled him to show that there was no pretence for a verdict against him upon the ground on which it was attempted to be supported. In this action the defendant was charged with having received money subscribed to relieve a persecuted and fallen man, and withholding that money, and *putting it in his own pocket*. He was charged with having, *under the pretence of public spirit, and a charitable sympathy* in the case of a person supposed to have been the victim of injustice, collected sums of money for his use, and diverted them from the proper channel. A graver or more serious charge could not be made against any person; but more particularly against a man, *every act of whose life completely rebutted such an imputation*. Persons might have different opinions with respect to Mr. Parkins's character and conduct as a public man—they might think that his discretion was not to be commended in the manner in which he spent his ample fortune; some persons might suppose that he acted from mere whim, and not from principle (although he, Mr. B., was not one of those persons), but it was too grave a charge for anybody to believe, that he had *not merely robbed the till, or robbed the church* (which was a sufficiently infamous imputation), but that *he had robbed the poor-box*, which was the worst of all possible complaints against any man. For his (Mr. B.) part he would not be-

lieve such a charge against Mr. Parkins or any other man, until he saw strong legal evidence of the fact. Nevertheless *the verdict*, as it now stood recorded against him, *must have the effect of giving sanction to such an imputation.* This was a topic, however, which he merely pressed as a ground for a favourable consideration of this motion, especially as the common sense of the transaction must show, that nothing could be more inconsistent, and indeed *impossible*, than that Mr. Parkins could, for any miserable views of pecuniary advantage, brand himself with such infamy as this verdict imported. Upon comparing the verdict on the late, with the verdict on the former trial, there was exactly the difference of 40*l.* between one and the other. This difference he understood to arise, not from any alteration in the state of facts, but because a person named Scott, who was examined on the former, had not been produced on the latter trial, and it was probable that *the same verdict would have been given, had that person been adduced as a witness on the last occasion.* Standing, therefore, as the second verdict did, upon the same principle, though it was not for the same amount as the first, the defendant was still deeply interested in showing, that both verdicts were founded on grounds equally injurious to him, as they affected his character, and the real justice of the case.—It was admitted on the other side, that the defendant had a set-off to the amount of 80*l.*, but had he had evidence which he had calculated upon being able to produce, he could have shown that *every farthing he had received by way of subscription, had been either paid to the plaintiff, or disbursed on his account.*—The principal witness in support of the plaintiff's case was Mr. Cobbett. Of that gentleman, he (Mr. B.) was not instructed to say any thing harsh or severe. Mr. Cobbett, however, like other men, was liable to inaccuracies in his recollection, and also suscep-

tible of those impressions to which all human beings were subject. There was no point in which men were more likely to err than in their recollection of dates and sums. Length of time was necessarily calculated to impair the memory, and produce an inability to speak with accuracy to circumstances in which they were not immediately interested. It often happened, however, that witnesses were induced to speak with certainty of particular transactions, under the influence of *some prejudice* against the party who was to be affected by their statements. For instance, if a man had an imperfect recollection of a particular circumstance, or wavered in doubt as to his memory of it, and being called upon to swear to it, he might be induced to speak one way or the other, according as his prejudices were against, or his prepossessions were in favour of him who was to be affected by his determination. It so happened in this case (and he spoke from the affidavit), that Mr. Cobbett was under the influence of some prejudice against the defendant. *Some time before this trial, Mr. Parkins had brought an action against Mr. Cobbett respecting the price of a horse, in which the former recovered a verdict, and, smarting under the consequences of the action, Mr. Cobbett had, in the language of Mr. Parkins's affidavit, imbibed "a rancorous animosity and a spirit of hostility" against him.* Upon looking into the imperfect notes furnished him (Mr. B.) of Mr. Cobbett's evidence, there certainly appeared to be no great affection subsisting between Mr. Parkins and that gentleman.

Mr. Justice Bayley.—The Jury had the opportunity of seeing the manner in which Mr. Cobbett gave his evidence, and of making their own observation upon his testimony.

Mr. Brougham.—Yes, my Lord, but if the Jury did not give the right weight to their observation, Mr. Parkins has some right to complain [a laugh]. There was something cava-

lier in the manner in which Mr. Cobbett gave his evidence, and certainly he had made several irrelevant observations. He (Mr. B.) could not give a specimen of the manner of Mr. Cobbett on the occasion, but he would repeat the words in which he gave his evidence. Mr. Parkins put this question to him, "*When do you say I made the admission of my having received the money?*" This was a simple question as to the date of a particular conversation, and poor Mr. Parkins was only desirous of having the month or the year fixed when the conversation was supposed to have taken place; but Mr. Cobbett was not satisfied with answering the question in the terms propounded, he thought proper to answer it by circumstances not at all required by the question. He said, "*It was the same time that you told me you were the son of the Duke of Norfolk.*" Mr. Cobbett was not satisfied with this, but added, "*It was the same time you told me also that you had lent the Noble Duke 28,000*l.*, and it was the same time you told me that Lord Sidmouth had paraded his daughters before you*" [a loud laugh.] Certainly it was not very likely that such a thing had happened as Mr. Cobbett had insinuated, and most likely was *told as a joke*; but undoubtedly this was an odd mode of answering a question by putting these particulars upon poor Mr. Parkins, and it was quite obvious, from the manner of answering it, that Mr. Cobbett had no design of doing Mr. Parkins a *very great service*, to say no more of the matter. Mr. Cobbett, in vouching the date of the conversation in which Mr. Parkins was supposed to have admitted that he had received 150*l.*, referred to the 25th or 27th of August, and fixed the date by referring to the time when the defendant had written a letter to Mr. Stanton, in Dublin. Now, assuming Mr. Cobbett to have given a correct representation of the conversation supposed to have taken place, the evi-

dence as to the fact of Mr. Parkins having said he had received 150*l.* was open to this material observation: Mr. Parkins might have talked loosely and at random, upon the subject of the subscription. He was the author of it—it was a *favourite child*—he had himself *generously subscribed 5*l.**, and he was in hopes that his example would influence others. With the warm feelings and zealous spirit in which he entered into the plaintiff's cause, he might have been induced to talk boastingly of the success of the subscription. The conversation of a man under such circumstances ought to be received with great indulgence. It was a subject of self-congratulation, and he might have been tempted to name a sum, as mere matter of sanguine expectation, without entering into a strict calculation of the means by which his hopes were to be realized. In the *warmth of his imagination*, he might have said something which, in reality, had no foundation, forgetting the difference between saying and doing—a man is often more apt to boast of his sayings than his doings. Probably this was Mr. Parkins's case, and he might have foolishly boasted of that which really had no foundation. The probability of the thing was inconsistent with the fact of the defendant having actually received in the short space of *two months* so large a sum as 150*l.* The subscriptions were collected in *pennies and twopences*, which were put into tin boxes soldered up and *sent about the town*. It was not at all likely that so large a sum could have been collected, and possibly the defendant, *without looking into the boxes*, had bragged of the prosperity of the subscription.

Mr. Justice Bayley.—All this was for the Jury to consider. It was for them to say whether it was probable or improbable.

Mr. Brougham.—But if they came to an erroneous conclusion, then their verdict is not right.

Mr. Justice Bayley.—Another Jury came to the same conclusion, according to your statement.

Mr. Brougham submitted, that Mr. Cobbett's evidence could not be correct, as he proposed to show by two letters written by him in the *Statesman* and the *Register*, long after the supposed conversation between him and the defendant. In confirmation of this, he had the affidavits of two of the defendant's clerks, named Taylor and Herbert, who fixed the time when the letter was written to Mr. Stanton of Dublin by the defendant, in which the latter wrote on the 24th August, stating that he had not then received any money, but was ready to advance 100*l.* out of his own pocket to assist the plaintiff, in the expectation of indemnifying himself by future subscriptions.

Mr. Justice Bayley observed, that both the persons mentioned had been examined at the trial, and their evidence had been submitted to the Jury.

The Chief Justice also said, that the letter alluded to as having been written by the defendant, could not be admissible as evidence for him on the trial of this cause.

Mr. Brougham said, he only alluded to it for the purpose of showing, that in point of fact, the defendant had not received 100*l.* at the time spoken of by Mr. Cobbett.

Mr. Justice Bayley observed, that according to Taylor's statement at the former trial, the defendant had received subscriptions amounting to 151*l.* 10*s.* But really the evidence now proposed to be given could not be admitted before another Jury.

Mr. Brougham submitted that the letter alluded to might be given in evidence to show the consistency of the defendant's conduct.

Mr. Justice Bayley.—That is quite impossible.

Mr. Brougham then proceeded to contend, that the letters written by Mr. Cobbett in the *Statesman*, and the *Register*, were inconsistent with the conversation which he attributed to the defendant. Mr. Cobbett was proved to be the Editor or Proprietor of the *Statesman* newspaper, and also of the *Register*.

Mr. Phillips interposed, and said that Mr. Cobbett had expressly said he was not the Editor of the *Statesman*.

Mr. Brougham said it was in evidence that Mr. Cobbett wrote articles for that paper, and he referred to the letters in question signed with Mr. Cobbett's name, which have been published respectively in the months of September and October, in which that gentleman spoke entirely of future subscriptions, and never mentioned one word of subscriptions already received by Mr. Parkins. Those letters warmly and zealously recommended the subscription on behalf of the plaintiff, and spoke of the benefit to be derived to him when the money should be received. If 150*l.* had been actually received by Mr. Parkins, that would have been a prominent circumstance to put forward to induce other persons to subscribe; but Mr. Cobbett was wholly silent upon the subject, and this demonstrated that he must have been mistaken in the admission which he attributed to the defendant.

Mr. Justice Bayley said, that this was all matter which might have been submitted to the Jury upon the last trial; and it was a settled rule, that a party could not obtain a new trial upon evidence which might have been adduced on the previous trial.

Mr. Brougham urged, that the defendant had not the advantage of Counsel's assistance.

The Chief Justice.—It was his own fault that he had not Counsel. But the defendant, in his address to the Jury, complained of the gentleman who, from ill health, was unable to conduct his case on the first trial, and he complained still more of the gentleman who held the brief on that occasion; and, in short, he went on to complain of every gentleman at the bar. [A laugh.]

Mr. Brougham went on to urge, that the letters before mentioned, one of which was published in the *Register*, of which Mr. Cobbett was the Proprietor, manifested the incon-

sistency of Mr. Cobbett's evidence. In the *Register* was given an account of the dinner to forward subscriptions for the plaintiff; that account must have been written by Mr. Cobbett.

The *Chief Justice*: Mr. Cobbett said, he was not the proprietor of the *Register* at that time, and that the account of the dinner to Byrne was taken from a newspaper; he said he had nothing to do with it.

Mr. Brougham: He was a fellow labourer with the Marquis of Hertford and Mr. Parkins in raising subscriptions, and he must have known, as well as Mr. Parkins, who the subscribers were. Certainly it was difficult to collect the names of the subscribers, the sums collected being so small. The learned Counsel then proceeded to urge, as another ground for a new trial, that Mr. Parkins had been deprived of the evidence of a witness named John William Lemoyne. This was a ground, he said, of the highest importance. The man had been subpoenaed by the defendant, but had by some means been kept out of the way. This was the person through whose hands all the subscriptions had passed, and he was competent to have proved that the subscriptions had never exceeded 152*l.*, and that every farthing of that sum had either been paid to the plaintiff, or disbursed for his benefit.

Mr. Justice Bayley observed, that this witness had been examined on the first trial, for the purpose of establishing the defendant's plea of set-off, and that he could not prove a set-off beyond the amount of 9*l.*

Mr. Brougham said, he understood that this witness could have completely negatived the evidence of Catherine Byrne, and have proved that money had been paid to the plaintiff to a large amount, beside disbursements for advertisements and other expenses incident to the subscription. The defendant, therefore, sustained great prejudice from the want of his evidence. This person had been subpoenaed on the day before the trial, and promised to come,

but he was not forthcoming when called on the defendant's behalf.

The *Chief Justice* asked of Mr. Brougham, if he had now an affidavit made by Lemoyne?

Mr. Brougham replied in the negative, for that Lemoyne was not to be found. In fact, Lemoyne had been subpoenaed several days before the trial, and was served with a second subpoena on the day preceding, and the defendant fully expected him to attend. On these grounds, therefore, he submitted that the defendant was entitled to a new trial. He admitted the disadvantage under which he laboured in presenting the case to the Court, from the circumstance of his not having attended the trial; and certainly a man who only came in at the eleventh hour, could hardly be expected to undertake the task so perfectly as he who had been present during the whole time. The statement of the case he had taken from the affidavits, and undoubtedly he laboured under a great disadvantage. All that Mr. Parkins wished was, that justice should be done to his fair character by another trial. Whatever opinion might be entertained of Mr. Parkins, as to his public life and conduct, there could be but one judgment formed as to his private worth and honour, which, through a long life, had never been impeached. As a private individual, he was entitled to an impartial hearing in a Court of Justice. He was now ready to bring the money into Court, and to pay the costs of the former trial.

Mr. Justice Bayley said, it did not appear to him that any sufficient ground had been laid before the Court for granting a new trial. On the second trial of this cause, the witness named Scott had not been examined, and consequently the verdict was not to the same amount as on the first trial. The defendant had derived great advantage from a second trial, because he had the opportunity of hearing all the merits of the plaintiff's case on the first, and

of preparing himself to meet the case when submitted a second time to the Jury. The defendant, therefore, came to the second trial with an advantage which seldom fell to the lot of suitors in a Court of Justice. It was a settled and most beneficial rule, never to grant a new trial on the ground that a party was not prepared with evidence which he might have added on a former trial, unless where he was completely taken by surprise, by evidence which he could not in common prudence be expected to be prepared to meet. Now here the defendant knew, beforehand, by the experience of the former trial, what sort of case he would be called upon to answer on the second. No new witness had been examined, and if the grounds now urged for a new trial were allowed, they might, with equal propriety, be pressed in almost every other case. If the defendant had found he could not safely proceed to trial without professional assistance, or for want of necessary evidence, he might have moved to postpone the cause until another occasion; but it could not be permitted to him to take the chance of a beneficial result, and then, upon finding the verdict of the Jury against him, come to the Court upon grounds, of which he might have availed himself for postponing the trial before it came to a decision. The first two grounds taken were clearly not tenable; and as to the third, namely, the absence of the witness Lemoyne, that was equally unavailing. If the defendant had sustained any prejudice from the want of that person's evidence, he had his remedy against him, either by attachment or action, for any damage he had sustained. That witness, however, had been examined on the first trial, and it did not appear that he would have given any material evidence on the second. Acting upon the settled rules of the Court (which could not be relaxed in favour of any individual), his Lordship was of opinion, that the verdict ought not to be disturbed,

but must be followed up by a judgment in the plaintiff's favour.

Mr. Justice Holroyd and Mr. Justice Littledale were of the same opinion.—Rule refused.

Now, I shall notice the *lies* in their due order. You, Mr. Brougham, say, "that it so happened, in this case, that Mr. Cobbett was under the influence of some prejudice against the defendant. Mr. Parkins had brought an action against Mr. Cobbett respecting the price of a horse; in which the former recovered a verdict, and, smarting under the consequences of this action, Mr. Cobbett had imbibed a rancorous animosity against Mr. Parkins." Now, this was a *base lie*, and an intentional one too. The evidence which I gave in April 1825, was *precisely that which I gave in February 1824*; and, mind, I never heard a single word about Parkins's horse, until May 1824; that is, *three months after the first trial about Byrne*. The fact is, then, the horse action followed *my evidence in favour of Byrne, and not my evidence the horse-action*. So that here is, through the channel of the "best public-instructor," a lie as complete, as base, and as malignant as lie can be.

The next lie is, that, in answer to *plain and pertinent* questions, I talked about things wholly unconnected with the matter. I never did. But, when the fellow put questions to me with an intention to insult me, I gave him a *chop*. And there he stood, looking so beautiful, and affording so much amusement; especially when he called upon the Chief Justice for protection against me," "No," said the Chief Jus-

tice; "I cannot protect you: you will not let me: you will put improper questions to the witness: and you must take the consequences."

Mr. BROUGHAM says, that, when his every-way-worthy client asked me, "when do you say I made the admission of having received the money," I answered by saying, that it was, when he told me, that he was the *late Duke of Norfolk's son*, and that the Duke owed him *twenty-eight thousand pounds*. This is another sheer lie. When I was asked, as to the time of Parkins's making the admission, I named the time as nearly as I could. But, when the fellow asked me, *whether I ever wanted to borrow money of him*, and meant thereby to cause the Court and Jury to believe that he had refused to lend me money, I then exclaimed, "Oh, no! I had never seen you but once, and that was for about thirty or forty minutes, when you told me, an utter stranger to you, that the late Duke of Norfolk was your father, and that he owed you twenty-eight thousand pounds. A likely thing that I should want to borrow money from such a fellow."

This staggered the fellow. It knocked him *all up in a heap*, as the saying is. It disconcerted him. He had prepared all his *insults and insinuations*. They were all numbered and labelled; and there was a sort of understrapper who held them ready to hand to him. But, when he got *chopped* in this way, he stood staring; and looking so beautiful! The fellow quite forgot several times, *what he was about*; so that I was obliged to call on him to get on. But, I never gave an evasive answer; I

never attempted to avoid a question; but, in every case, gave a direct answer, and that, too, without any hesitation.

Mr. BROUGHAM says, that I said, that Parkins told me about the DUKE of NORFOLK, and about SIDMOUTH'S DAUGHTERS at the same time. This is false. The first was in 1817, and the last in 1822. Then he says that I *insinuated* these things. Just the contrary; for the fellow (being flustered by my answers) said: "So, you say, that Lord Sidmouth paraded his daughters before me, to get me to marry one of them." "No, no, God forbid," exclaimed I, "I say, that you said so, and that you told a falsehood." "Well then," said he, "you say, that I am the Duke of Norfolk's father"! Thus the fellow got bewildered, and, really did not know what he said.

Another lie was this: Mr. Brougham said, that my account of what Parkins told me in September 1822, did not agree with what I published on the subject in November 1822. But, let me explain this. Parkins now says, that he received but 151*l.* 10*s.* in the whole. I swore, that he told me, in September 1822, that he had THEN received about 150*l.* Now, said Mr. Brougham, it was, in November 1822, stated in the *Statesman* newspaper and in the *Register*, that, even then, there was only about 100*l.* collected by Parkins. And, said Mr. Brougham, "Mr. Cobbett was proved to be the Editor of the *Statesman*." This was a most barefaced falsehood. The direct contrary was proved; and so the Chief Justice and Mr. Phillips instantly said. I said, in my cross-examination, that I never had any

thing to do with *editing* the Statesman, that I *never was in the office of that paper in my life*, and I might have added, that I never even saw the editor above once in my life. The article in question came out of the Statesman into the Register; I was at Reading the day that it was published; and, as I told Parkins in court, he might, for any thing that I knew, *have written it himself*.

What had a paragraph like this to do with my evidence as to what Parkins told me in September 1822? Every thing turned upon this evidence of mine. Parkins acknowledged having received about 130*l.* after the date of the admission to me. He had sets-off for this; but, he did not account for the 150*l.* that I said he said he had before. Now, then, as all (in the absence of Mr. Scott) turned upon, *whether the jury believed that he told me that he had the 150*l.* in September 1822*, there is one fact which it is material to notice; a fact well known to all who were present at the last trial; a fact which can leave no doubt in the mind of any man: it is this: Parkins asked me God knows how many questions about this admission of the 150*l.* He endeavoured to mix up his relevant matter with *insinuations* and *insults*; but, he got from me such hard raps in return, that, in a short time, he became what is aptly enough called "*bothered*." He could not deny, that he had proposed, in Sept. 1822, to send 100*l.* to Dublin for BYRNE. He could not deny this, because he had written to Ireland on the subject, at the time. This, therefore, strongly corroborated what I said. But, he wished it to be believed, that, when he proposed to send the

100*l.*, he meant to *advance* it, to lend it, to Byrne, in the hope, as his lawyer, Mr. Brougham, calls it, of "*indemnifying himself by future subscriptions*." Ah! was Parkins a creature likely to do this? Was he, who charged poor BYRNE for *sealingwax*, a fellow to "*advance*" 100*l.* to a poor man, whom he had never seen? Was he, who charged *twopence halfpenny* upon some occasion, who charged *postage*, who charged many pounds for *clerkship*, who charged *advertisements*, in which his own "*generosity*" was extolled to the skies: was this a fellow, I ask, to *lend* 100*l.* to a poor Irishman, whom he had never seen, and never might see; and that, too, upon the faith of a subscription, which according to his *now* account, had, at the time, yielded only about *seventeen pounds*? Monstrous! Nobody can believe the thing for a single moment.

But, if there had been any body to believe it, before this fellow cross-examined me on the last trial, no one could believe it after that: for, being, as I observed above, *bothered* by me, in retorts for his insolence, and being urged by me to *get on*, he, amongst the rest of his questions, blundered out these: "So, you say that I proposed to send £100 to Dublin? — Yes, I do, and you can't deny it. — Did not you propose to me to put the 100*l.* in the American funds? — Ah! you have caught yourself? How could I propose to you to put the money in the American funds, if you had not received the money? How could there be any talk of American funds, if you were going to lend Byrne the 100*l.*? — This was conclusive; the fellow had trapped him-

self. I said, that I never proposed to put any money in any funds; but *he might*, and thought it was likely he did. At any rate, nobody ever could have thought of *American funds*, unless it had been clearly understood, that the money *was money in hand*; and not money about to be "*advanced*," or "*lent*." After this detection, he kept asking questions at a sort of random: "And so," said he, "you say that I proposed to *lend* the 106l?" "No," said I, "I said no such thing: I said *send*, and not *lend*: for how could you talk of "*lending* Byrne money to *put in the American funds*?"

No Jury could have any doubt after this: and, accordingly, in spite of all the *protestations* and *vows* of the fellow, the jury founded their verdict upon my evidence. Mr. BROUGHAM says, I gave it in a "*cavalier manner*." But, as Mr. JUSTICE BAILEY observed, the jury *saw*, and could *judge*, of that manner. I was by no means disposed to do any thing but my strict duty, which was to answer directly and plainly all the questions put to me touching the matter. But, when the fellow began what I could see was an arranged series of insults, I thought the most judicious as well as the most just way, was, to give him *good hard raps*; which he got, and which made him look so *sensible*, and more especially so *beautiful*! Good God! I wish all the nation could have seen him!

To rub off these raps the fellow hired Mr. Brougham, knowing that he had *some raps of his own* to rub off, if practicable, at the same time. He has not succeeded yet. He must try his hand at it another time; and, in the meanwhile, I leave him to enjoy the friend-

ship and society of his client. They are quite worthy of each other. They may be fellow-labourers in the education-plan. They may form a joint-stock company in law and morals. Parkins must be particularly useful, where there are *subscriptions*. That "*generosity*," which his advocate so much extols, cannot fail to be of great utility, provided it be kept from *boiling over*, as it sometimes appears to have done upon poor Byrne.

Since writing the above, I have been informed that PARKINS has paid the money at last. I heard that he was about to apply for a Writ of Error. If he had done that, it would have been necessary for somebody to advance the money for poor BYRNE, and to get it from PARKINS after he had done his best about the Writ of Error. However, the thing is now settled, and he has paid to Byrne, a hundred and fifty-three pounds, though, as Mr. BROUGHAM says, every farthing that PARKINS had received by way of subscription, had been either paid to BYRNE or disbursed on BYRNE's account. Mr. BROUGHAM says, that the whole that PARKINS had received, never exceeded one hundred and fifty-two pounds; and yet, after two trials, one before a special jury and one before a common jury, PARKINS has actually paid one hundred and fifty-three pounds to BYRNE, though he had, as Mr. BROUGHAM says, paid BYRNE or laid out on BYRNE's account, the whole of that sum before. What juries these must have been, or, what assertions these must be of this pretty pair, Messrs. Parkins and Brougham.

I have now to close the history of this affair; or, to close my pre-

sent remarks upon it; for, it is not my intention to let PARKINS escape thus. This is a very memorable affair. Mr. BROUGHAM is reported to have said, that "the verdict, as it now stood recorded against him, must have the effect of giving sanction to an imputation, that PARKINS *had robbed the poor-box.*" This is Parkins's own advocate's description of the effect of the verdict. It is not one verdict, mind: there were two verdicts; and the Judges of the Court of King's Bench, by refusing to grant Parkins another Trial, gave their sanction to the last verdict. However, I shall another time return to this Parkins. In the meanwhile, I shall conclude what I have now to say upon the subject, by inserting an affidavit of BYRNE, which I take from the *Dublin Morning Register* of the 9th of May. I should first observe, however, that on the last trial, there came as a witness for PARKINS, Mr. HENRY HUNT. I was not in Court when Mr. HUNT was examined; but, I read in the *Morning Chronicle*, that Mr. HUNT said, that BYRNE spoke evil of me to him, Mr. HUNT, and complained that he could not get from me the subscription money that I received for him. Mr. Hunt said that, at this time, when BYRNE complained of me, *he spoke greatly in praise of Parkins.* This appeared to be the most wonderful thing in the world; for, I never made any collections for BYRNE, until after the first trial took place; therefore, I could have none of his money till after that trial; and, surely the man must have been in a mad fit if he spoke in praise of PARKINS after that trial!

The public will understand that

there were two subscriptions for BYRNE, Parkins made himself the Treasurer of the first, he collected money in various ways. He had tin boxes put up at twenty or thirty places in London, one of which boxes was at my shop in Fleet Street. So that, I never had any money of Byrne's in my hands, belonging to this first subscription. I received money, but I paid it to PARKINS. Even the money put into my hands at the dinner, I handed over to PARKINS. Therefore, it is the strangest thing in the whole world that BYRNE should have complained to Mr. HUNT of me while he was speaking handsomely of PARKINS. The second subscription was made by me, but this was after the first trial. The moment that trial was over, I began to advance BYRNE something weekly for him and his daughter to live upon. It is barely possible, that, while this subscription was going on, BYRNE might have complained of me to Mr. HUNT, but then, observe, it is absolutely impossible, that BYRNE could, at the same time, have spoken in praise of PARKINS. And here I have to notice the base and wicked conduct of the London newspapers. The *Morning Chronicle*, for instance, inserted this evidence of Mr. HUNT; but it took special care to leave out the evidence of Mr. CHARLES CLEMENT, who said that I never touched BYRNE's money, that he, Mr. CLEMENT, received it. That he kept an account of it, that he advanced money to BYRNE as he wanted it, that he paid him over the balance some time in July last, that he took his receipt for that balance; and that, to the very last hour of BYRNE's remaining in London, he

continued to express, upon all occasions, his gratitude towards me; and that when he went away he left his daughter in my house. This evidence that black-hearted newspaper took special care to omit; and this, amongst a thousand others that I could cite, is a proof of the mischievous tendency of publishing reports of trials in the manner in which they are now published.

I have now only to add the affidavit of BYRNE, published as above mentioned; but I cannot insert it without distinctly saying that *I believe every word of it to be true*. The reader will be better able to judge for himself, when told that there was scarcely a day, for the last twelve months that BYRNE was in England, when he was not, at one or the other of my houses, where there was always victuals and drink for him, three times in the day if he chose it. Every Sunday he and his family, and, after Mrs. BYRNE and her smaller children went away, he and his daughter, dined and drank tea at my house at Kensington, and this, observe, to the very last Sunday of his being in London. Let the reader judge for himself then. Here is BYRNE's affidavit, and again I say I believe every word of it to be true.

"Poor Byrne—Parkins—Henry Hunt.

County of the City of Dublin, to Wit.

"James Byrne, of the City of Dublin, Coachman, maketh Oath on the Holy Evangelists, that in a report of the proceedings in the English Court of King's Bench, in the case of Byrne and Parkins, he the Deponent saw an assertion, purporting to have been made by

"Henry Hunt, to the effect, that he the Deponent spoke to the said Hunt of William Cobbett, Esq. in abusive terms, and cast reflections on the integrity of Mr. Cobbett. Deponent solemnly swears that this assertion is totally false and unfounded; and that he never spoke to said Hunt disrespectfully or injuriously of Mr. Cobbett; and that, if he had done so, he would be guilty of the blackest ingratitude; Mr. Cobbett and all his family having acted towards said Deponent and his family with a generosity and kindness that totally surpasses his powers of description, and shall remain engraven on his heart to the latest hour of his existence.

"JAMES BYRNE.

"Sworn before me this 22th day of April, 1825.

"DRURY JONES."

My correspondent at Royston shall have an answer next week.

MARKETS.

Average Prices of CORN throughout ENGLAND, for the week ending April 30.

Per Quarter.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
Wheat ..	67	0	Oats	23	11
Rye	36	3	Beans ...	35	10
Barley ..	36	3	Peas	36	10

Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.

Quantities and Prices of British Corn, &c. sold and delivered in this Market, during the week ended Saturday, April 30.

	Qrs.	£.	s.	d.		s.	d.
Wheat	7,793 for	27,512	3	7	Average,	79	7
Barley..	2,184....	4,203	12	0	38	5
Oats	13,035....	17,079	8	11	26	2
Rye	198....	185	11	0	34	4
Beans ..	1,210....	2,183	10	4	36	1
Peas	369.....	671	9	5	36	4

Friday, May 6.—The arrivals of all sorts of Grain since Monday are moderate. There is no superfine Wheat at market, and as our Millers neglect all other qualities, the trade is reported 2s. per quarter lower than Monday. Barley is scarce, and very little doing at last quotations. Beans and Peas are without variation. Oats find sale slowly, and hardly maintain Monday's rates.

Monday, May 9.—There were moderate arrivals of all sorts of Corn last week. The fresh supply of Wheat this morning from Essex, Kent, and Suffolk, is much larger and better in quality than for some weeks past. Of Barley, Beans, Peas, and Oats, the arrivals are not considerable. The weather being remarkably favourable, and the first portion of the bonded Wheat being expected in the market in a few days, occasion our Millers to decline purchasing, and the trade for Wheat has been so extremely dull as to reduce the price from 4s. to 5s. per quarter since this day se'nnight, and inferior samples are reduced still more.

Barley is declined 1s. per quarter since last Monday. Beans are also 1s. to 2s. per quarter lower. Peas are without alteration. Oats are not very plentiful, but as other articles are lower, the buyers of Horse Corn will not give last week's prices, and they are declined full 1s. per quarter, at which there is a slow sale. The Flour trade is very dull.

Total Quantity of Corn returned as Sold in the Maritime Districts, for the Week ended April 30.

Qrs.	Qrs.
Wheat .. 35,945	Oats ... 31,758
Rye 669	Beans ... 4,128
Barley .. 17,483	Peas 639

Price of Bread.—The price of the 4lb. Loaf is stated at 10½d. by the full-priced Bakers.

Account of Wheat, &c. arrived in the Port of London, from May 2 to May 7, both inclusive.

Qrs.	Qrs.
Wheat .. 5,071	Tares 100
Barley .. 2,055	Linseed .. 1,078
Malt 4,044	Rapeseed . —
Oats 11,693	Brank .. 1,605
Beans ... 636	Mustard .. —
Flour 7,071	Flax —
Rye —	Hemp ... —
Peas 133	Seeds ... 97

Foreign.—Wheat, 2,640; Barley, 2,445; and Oats, 1,310 qrs.

Monday, May 9.—The arrivals from Ireland last week were 1,769 hales of Bacon; and from Foreign Ports 5,861 casks of Butter.

SMITHFIELD, Monday, May 9.

Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	4	0	to 5	0
Mutton ...	4	4	— 5	2
Veal	6	0	— 7	0
Pork	5	4	— 6	4
Lamb	6	8	— 7	8

Beasts ... 2,551	Sheep .. 14,810
Calves ... 145	Pigs 150

NEWGATE, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	3	4	to 4	0
Mutton ...	3	8	— 4	8
Veal	4	0	— 6	4
Pork	4	0	— 6	0
Lamb	5	0	— 7	0

LEADENHALL, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	3	6	to 4	0
Mutton ...	4	0	— 4	8
Veal	3	8	— 6	0
Pork	4	4	— 6	0
Lamb	5	4	— 6	8

POTATOES.

SPITALFIELDS.—per Ton.

Ware.....	£3	0	to	£5	0
Middlings.....	2	10	—	2	5
Chats.....	2	10	—	0	0
Common Red..	0	0	—	0	0

BOROUGH.—per Ton.

Ware.....	£3	0	to	£5	10
Middlings.....	2	10	—	2	0
Chats.....	2	0	—	2	5
Common Red..	3	0	—	4	15

HAY and STRAW, per Load.

Smithfield.—Hay....	63s.	to	110s.
Straw...	40s.	to	48s.
Clover..	80s.	to	110s.
St. James's.—Hay....	68s.	to	100s.
Straw ..	36s.	to	51s.
Clover..	70s.	to	100s.
Whitechapel.—Hay....	70s.	to	100s.
Straw...	40s.	to	50s.
Clover..	80s.	to	115s.

COAL MARKET, May 6.

Ships at Market. Ships sold. Price.

12½ Newcastle..	9½	31s. 6d.	to	38s. 6d.
2 Sunderland..	2	37s. 6d.	—	41s. 0d.

COUNTRY CORN MARKETS.

By the QUARTER, excepting where otherwise named; from Wednesday to Saturday last, inclusive.

The Scotch Markets are the Returns of the Week before.

	Wheat.			Barley.			Oats.			Beans.			Pease.		
	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.
Aylesbury	68	76	0	40	42	0	25	30	0	38	48	0	0	0	0
Banbury	68	76	0	43	46	0	25	31	6	38	52	0	0	0	0
Basingstoke	66	77	0	39	46	0	21	29	0	40	43	0	0	0	0
Bridport.....	58	72	0	36	37	0	24	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	0
Chelmsford.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Derby.....	72	77	0	42	47	0	25	30	0	40	56	0	0	0	0
Devizes.....	56	82	0	34	52	0	24	32	0	40	56	0	0	0	0
Dorchester.....	48	72	0	32	41	0	23	32	0	40	52	0	0	0	0
Exeter.....	70	77	0	40	44	0	22	26	0	47	48	0	0	0	0
Eye.....	60	68	0	30	40	0	22	28	0	36	40	0	34	38	0
Guildford.....	62	84	0	34	44	0	23	32	0	42	50	0	40	44	0
Henley.....	64	85	0	34	45	0	24	30	0	40	49	0	38	46	0
Horncastle.....	60	70	0	35	40	0	18	25	0	38	42	0	0	0	0
Hungerford.....	61	80	0	32	44	0	25	34	0	42	56	0	0	0	0
Lewes.....	68	76	0	0	0	0	25	30	0	42	0	0	0	0	0
Newbury	62	84	0	30	45	0	20	32	0	40	45	0	38	44	0
Newcastle	54	68	0	22	44	0	18	26	0	36	40	0	32	54	0
Northampton....	61	76	0	41	46	0	23	27	0	36	42	0	46	48	0
Nottingham	*66	0	0	44	0	0	25	0	0	48	0	0	0	0	0
Reading	62	85	0	33	46	0	26	32	0	40	47	0	43	46	0
Stamford.....	69	75	6	38	45	0	22	30	0	40	42	0	0	0	0
Stowmarket	57	71	0	22	38	0	20	25	0	32	37	0	32	35	0
Swansea.....	72	0	0	40	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Truro	73	0	0	42	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uxbridge	64	87	0	32	44	0	25	32	0	38	45	0	42	44	0
Warminster.....	54	74	0	33	50	0	25	32	0	44	56	0	0	0	0
Winchester.....	69	0	0	38	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dalkeith*	34	39	0	29	35	0	18	21	6	18	20	0	18	20	0
Haddington*....	31	38	6	28	36	0	17	21	0	16	20	6	16	19	6

* Dalkeith and Haddington are given by the *boll*.—The Scotch *boll* for Wheat, Rye, Pease, and Beans, is three per cent. more than 4 bushels. The *boll* of Barley and Oats, is about 6 bushels Winchester, or as 6 to 8 compared with the English *quarter*.

Liverpool, May 3.—In consequence of the observations made by Ministers on the subject of the Corn Laws, a brisk demand was experienced in this market on Wednesday last, for both Wheat and Oats, at an ultimate advance from that period down to Saturday, of 6*d.* per 70 lbs. on the former, and on the latter fully 3*d.* per 45 lbs., at which ratio further speculative purchases were made yesterday. But at this day's market there was but little business done at about the advance noted, and the previous spirit for speculation evidently subsided.

Imported into Liverpool, from the 26th of April to the 2d of May, 1825, inclusive:—Wheat, 2,684; Barley, 314; Oats, 17,753; Malt, 2,992; Beans, 1,479; Peas, 57 quarters. Flour, 450 sacks, per 280 lbs. Oatmeal, 509 packs, per 240 lbs. European Flour, 6,303 barrels.

Norwich, May 7.—The Corn trade was very dull at a reduction of about 2*s.* Wheat, from 62*s.* to 71*s.*; Barley, 36*s.* to 40*s.*; and Oats, 25*s.* to 29*s.* per quarter.

Bristol, May 7.—The following quotations relative to Corn, &c. may be considered nearly correct:—Wheat, from 6*s.* 3*d.* to 9*s.* 3*d.*; Barley, 3*s.* 6*d.* to 5*s.* 10½*d.*; Beans, 3*s.* 6*d.* to 7*s.*; Oats, 2*s.* 3*d.* to 3*s.* 3*d.*; and Malt, 5*s.* 6*d.* to 8*s.* per bushel. Flour, Seconds, 30*s.* to 55*s.* per bag.

Birmingham, May 5.—On this day se'nnight we had an advance on Wheat, Barley, Malt, Oats, Beans and Peas of about 2*s.* per quarter each, and 2*s.* per sack on Flour; to-day, a further advance of about 2*s.* took place on Wheat, and the same on Flour (the retail price of the latter has risen 2*d.* per 14 lbs.;) other articles fully maintained the prices of last week. The supply of Wheat is much greater both here and at the neighbouring markets.

Ipswich, May 7.—Our market was largely supplied for the season, with all Grain. Wheat was 3*s.*, and Barley 1*s.* per quarter lower.

Wisbech, May 7.—There was a good show of Wheat here to-day; the trade generally dull, at a decline of full 2*s.* per quarter.

Malton, May 7.—Some advance has taken place this week, and all sorts of Grain more in demand. Prices nearly as below:—Wheat, 72*s.* to 76*s.* per quarter, five stone per bushel; Barley, 40*s.* to 43*s.* per quarter, to weigh 32 stone; and Oats, 12*d.* to 12½*d.* per stone.

Hull, May 6.—We had considerable animation in the Corn trade on Tuesday, and although the buyers showed a disposition to give an advance of 3*s.* on Wheat, 2*s.* on Beans, and 1*s.* to 2*s.* per quarter on Oats and Barley, still the holders generally anticipated a further advance, and were not induced to do business except on higher terms; the sales in consequence were exceedingly limited.

Lynn, May 5.—We had not so good a demand for Wheat on Tuesday as might have been expected (considering the fate of Mr. Whitmore's motion): the best samples could not be noted more than 2*s.* per quarter dearer, and on these terms not much business done. Oats and Beans at an improvement of 1*s.* per quarter.

Yarmouth, May 5.—Our Market was better supplied with Wheat than it has been of late; the Millers being short of stock, they purchased freely on rather higher terms. Barley 1*s.* per quarter cheaper.

POTATOES.

SPITALFIELDS.—per Ton.

Ware.....	£3	0	to	£5	0
Middlings.....	2	10	—	2	5
Chats.....	2	10	—	0	0
Common Red..	0	0	—	0	0

BOROUGH.—per Ton.

Ware.....	£3	0	to	£5	10
Middlings.....	2	10	—	2	0
Chats.....	2	0	—	2	5
Common Red..	3	0	—	4	15

HAY and STRAW, per Load.

Smithfield.—Hay...	63s.	to	110s.
Straw...	40s.	to	48s.
Clover..	80s.	to	110s.
St. James's.—Hay....	68s.	to	100s.
Straw...	36s.	to	51s.
Clover..	70s.	to	100s.
Whitechapel.—Hay....	70s.	to	100s.
Straw...	40s.	to	50s.
Clover..	80s.	to	115s.

COAL MARKET, May 6.

Ships at Market. Ships sold. Price.

12½ Newcastle..	9½	31s.6d.	to	38s.6d.
2 Sunderland..	2	37s.6d.—	41s.0d.	

COUNTRY CORN MARKETS.

By the QUARTER, excepting where otherwise named; from Wednesday to Saturday last, inclusive.

The Scotch Markets are the Returns of the Week before.

	Wheat.			Barley.			Oats.			Beans.			Pease.		
	s.	to s.	d.	s.	to s.	d.	s.	to s.	d.	s.	to s.	d.	s.	to s.	d.
Aylesbury	68	76	0	40	42	0	25	30	0	38	48	0	0	0	0
Banbury	68	76	0	43	46	0	25	31	6	38	52	0	0	0	0
Basingstoke	66	77	0	39	46	0	21	29	0	40	43	0	0	0	0
Bridport	58	72	0	36	37	0	24	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	0
Chelmsford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Derby	72	77	0	42	47	0	25	30	0	40	56	0	0	0	0
Devizes	56	82	0	34	52	0	24	32	0	40	56	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	48	72	0	32	41	0	23	32	0	40	52	0	0	0	0
Exeter	70	77	0	40	44	0	22	26	0	47	48	0	0	0	0
Eye	60	68	0	30	40	0	22	28	0	36	40	0	34	38	0
Guildford	62	84	0	34	44	0	23	32	0	42	50	0	40	44	0
Henley	64	85	0	34	45	0	24	30	0	40	49	0	38	46	0
Horncastle	60	70	0	35	40	0	18	25	0	38	42	0	0	0	0
Hungerford	61	80	0	32	44	0	25	34	0	42	56	0	0	0	0
Lewes	68	76	0	0	0	0	25	30	0	42	0	0	0	0	0
Newbury	62	84	0	30	45	0	20	32	0	40	45	0	38	44	0
Newcastle	54	68	0	22	44	0	18	26	0	36	40	0	38	54	0
Northampton	61	76	0	41	46	0	23	27	0	36	42	0	46	48	0
Nottingham	*66	0	0	44	0	0	25	0	0	48	0	0	0	0	0
Reading	62	85	0	33	46	0	26	32	0	40	47	0	43	46	0
Stamford	69	75	6	38	45	0	22	30	0	40	42	0	0	0	0
Stowmarket	57	71	0	22	38	0	20	25	0	32	37	0	32	35	0
Swansea	72	0	0	40	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Truro	73	0	0	42	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uxbridge	64	87	0	32	44	0	25	32	0	38	45	0	42	44	0
Warminster	54	74	0	33	50	0	25	32	0	44	56	0	0	0	0
Winchester	69	0	0	38	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dalkeith*	34	39	0	29	35	0	18	21	6	18	20	0	18	20	0
Haddington*	31	38	6	28	36	0	17	21	0	16	20	6	16	19	6

* Dalkeith and Haddington are given by the *boll*.—The Scotch *boll* for Wheat, Rye, Pease, and Beans, is three per cent. more than 4 bushels. The *boll* of Barley and Oats, is about 6 bushels Winchester, or as 6 to 8 compared with the English *quarter*.

Liverpool, May 3.—In consequence of the observations made by Ministers on the subject of the Corn Laws, a brisk demand was experienced in this market on Wednesday last, for both Wheat and Oats, at an ultimate advance from that period down to Saturday, of 6*d.* per 70 lbs. on the former, and on the latter fully 3*d.* per 45 lbs., at which ratio further speculative purchases were made yesterday. But at this day's market there was but little business done at about the advance noted, and the previous spirit for speculation evidently subsided.

Imported into Liverpool, from the 26th of April to the 2d of May, 1825, inclusive:—Wheat, 2,684; Barley, 314; Oats, 17,753; Malt, 2,992; Beans, 1,479; Peas, 57 quarters. Flour, 450 sacks, per 260 lbs. Oatmeal, 509 packs, per 240 lbs. European Flour, 6,303 barrels.

Norwich, May 7.—The Corn trade was very dull at a reduction of about 2*s.* Wheat, from 62*s.* to 71*s.*; Barley, 36*s.* to 40*s.*; and Oats, 25*s.* to 29*s.* per quarter.

Bristol, May 7.—The following quotations relative to Corn, &c. may be considered nearly correct:—Wheat, from 6*s.* 3*d.* to 9*s.* 3*d.*; Barley, 3*s.* 6*d.* to 5*s.* 10½*d.*; Beans, 3*s.* 6*d.* to 7*s.*; Oats, 2*s.* 3*d.* to 3*s.* 3*d.*; and Malt, 5*s.* 6*d.* to 8*s.* per bushel. Flour, Seconds, 30*s.* to 55*s.* per bag.

Birmingham, May 5.—On this day se'nnight we had an advance on Wheat, Barley, Malt, Oats, Beans and Peas of about 2*s.* per quarter each, and 2*s.* per sack on Flour; to-day, a further advance of about 2*s.* took place on Wheat, and the same on Flour (the retail price of the latter has risen 2*d.* per 14 lbs.;) other articles fully maintained the prices of last week. The supply of Wheat is much greater both here and at the neighbouring markets.

Ipswich, May 7.—Our market was largely supplied for the season, with all Grain. Wheat was 3*s.*, and Barley 1*s.* per quarter lower.

Wisbech, May 7.—There was a good show of Wheat here to-day; the trade generally dull, at a decline of full 2*s.* per quarter.

Malton, May 7.—Some advance has taken place this week, and all sorts of Grain more in demand. Prices nearly as below:—Wheat, 72*s.* to 76*s.* per quarter, five stone per bushel; Barley, 40*s.* to 43*s.* per quarter, to weigh 32 stone; and Oats, 12*d.* to 12½*d.* per stone.

Hull, May 6.—We had considerable animation in the Corn trade on Tuesday, and although the buyers showed a disposition to give an advance of 3*s.* on Wheat, 2*s.* on Beans, and 1*s.* to 2*s.* per quarter on Oats and Barley, still the holders generally anticipated a further advance, and were not induced to do business except on higher terms; the sales in consequence were exceedingly limited.

Lynn, May 5.—We had not so good a demand for Wheat on Tuesday as might have been expected (considering the fate of Mr. Whitmore's motion): the best samples could not be noted more than 2*s.* per quarter dearer, and on these terms not much business done. Oats and Beans at an improvement of 1*s.* per quarter.

Yarmouth, May 5.—Our Market was better supplied with Wheat than it has been of late; the Millers being short of stock, they purchased freely on rather higher terms. Barley 1*s.* per quarter cheaper.

COUNTRY CATTLE AND MEAT MARKETS, &c.

Norwich Castle Meadow, May 7.—The show of Cattle, both fat and lean, was very indifferent, and a dull sale for the former, but the lean Scots sold readily from 4s. 6d. to 5s. 3d. per stone of 14 lbs. when fat. The supply of Sheep also was not large for the season, and the sale was good. Beef, 6½d. to 7½d.; Veal, 7d. to 8d.; Mutton, 6½d. to 7½d.; and Pork, 7d. to 8d. per lb.

Horncastle, May 7.—Beef, 8s. per stone of 14 lbs.; Mutton, 8d.; Lamb, 10d.; Pork, 7d. to 7½d.; and Veal, 8d. to 9d. per lb.

Bristol, May 5.—Beef from 6½d. to 7d.; Mutton, 7d. to 8d.; and Pork, 6d. to 6½d. per lb. sinking offal.

Malton, May 7.—Meat in the shambles:—Beef, 6½d. to 8d.; Mutton, 7d. to 8d.; Lamb, 10d.; and Veal, 7d. to 8d. per lb. Fresh Butter, 11d. to 12d. per lb. of 18 oz. Bacon Sides, 7s. 3d. to 7s. 6d.; large Hams, 9s.; small ditto, 10s. per stone.

Morpeth Market, on Wednesday, was well supplied with Cattle and Sheep, and there being a good demand, the former sold readily; the latter met with rather dull sale; prices much the same.—Beef, from 6s. 9d. to 7s. 6d.; Mutton, 9s. 4d. to 10s. per stone, sinking offal.

Manchester, May 4.—On sale 1,352 Sheep, at 7½d. to 9d. per lb. sinking the offal; 285 Cattle, at 6½d. to 8½d.; 5 Pigs; 223 Lambs, at 9d. to 11d.—Total, 2,330.

AVERAGE PRICE OF CORN, sold in the Maritime Counties of England and Wales, for the Week ended April 30, 1825.

	Wheat.		Barley.		Oats.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
London*	69	1	39	2	25	4
Essex	69	1	33	8	26	1
Kent.....	69	0	42	4	26	3
Sussex.....	67	5	37	0	25	10
Suffolk	68	2	34	9	26	4
Cambridgeshire.....	64	1	33	4	20	3
Norfolk	65	9	33	2	25	9
Lincolnshire	66	1	41	10	22	2
Yorkshire	61	1	38	7	20	10
Durham	62	2	42	6	24	3
Northumberland	59	4	35	5	22	7
Cumberland	67	2	36	10	24	2
Westmoreland	70	1	41	0	24	9
Lancashire	65	7	0	0	23	8
Cheshire	66	9	0	0	27	1
Gloucestershire.....	70	3	42	10	27	8
Somersetshire	70	2	41	5	23	7
Monmouthshire	70	2	42	6	25	0
Devonshire.....	69	10	40	10	27	5
Cornwall.....	71	2	39	3	28	10
Dorsetshire	68	9	38	3	26	9
Hampshire	68	8	37	10	27	3
North Wales	66	3	45	4	22	8
South Wales ...	65	4	38	8	20	0

* The London Average is always that of the Week preceding.